



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/727,709	12/04/2000	Stacy Bryant	52493.000126	3945

7590 09/11/2002

Hunton & Williams
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006-1109

EXAMINER

THAI, HANH B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2171

DATE MAILED: 09/11/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/727,709

Applicant(s)

BRYANT ET AL.

Examiner

Hanh B Thai

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 December 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

This is in response to application filed on December 4, 2000 in which claims 1-24 are presented for examination.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Faloutsos et al. U. S. patent no. 5,758,338.

1. Regarding claims 1-3, Faloutsos discloses a process for performing administrative functions connected with a sales related database comprising the steps of:

- receiving updated information for the sales-related database in a file configured in a predetermined format (column 3, lines 44-48);
- saving the configured file containing the updated information to the sales related database (column 3, lines 48-56); and

Faloutsos, however, does not explicitly disclose uploading the sales-related database to a web-based database using an administrative tool. But, Faloutsos does teach the processor has functionality of downloading data over the bus on (column 3, lines 58-65). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to upload information

in the sales-related database to the web-based database, in order to distribute the information over the Internet.

Claims 4-5, 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faloutsos et al. U. S. Patent no. 5,758,338 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Johnson et al. U. S. Patent no. 6,067,525.

2. Regarding claim 4, Faloutsos does not explicitly disclose

- a user login module for restricting access to the system
- a database access module for accessing data stored in the sales-related database and for

reading one or more configured files; and

- a file upload module for uploading data to the sales-related database and the system.

But, it is well known to divide program into multiple modules as evidenced by Johnson (FIG. 16: "product module", "configurator module" and "respective module") because it is more efficient to create and debug software.

3. Regarding claim 5, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim

4. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 4 above. In addition, Johnson discloses the system comprising a report building module for presenting data in one or more predetermined formats and for generating one or more reports (Fig. 15A-C).

4. Regarding claim 7, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 4. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 4 above. In addition, John discloses the system wherein the file upload module further comprises a form generator to generate preconfigured forms for receiving one or more information updates (column 11, lines 47-57).

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faloutsos et al. U. S. Patent no. 5,758,338 as applied to claim 1 above, further in view of Johnson et al. U. S. Patent no. 6,067,525 and view of Harris et al. U. S. Patent no. 5,893,904.

5. Regarding claim 6, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 4. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 4 above. Furthermore, neither Faloutsos nor Johnson discloses, "broker operations module ". Harris, however, discloses this limitation on (column 18, lines 50-54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teaching of Faloutsos and Johnson, as taught by Harris to manage the brokers' information.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faloutsos et al. U. S. Patent no. 5,758,338 as applied to claim 1 above, further in view of Johnson et al. U. S. Patent no. 6,067,525 and view of Kappel U. S. Patent no. 6,144,988.

6. Regarding claim 8, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 7. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 7 above. Furthermore, neither

Art Unit: 2171

Faloutsos nor Johnson discloses "servlet module". Kappel, however, discloses this limitation (see abstract of Kappel). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teaching of Faloutsos and Johson, as taught by Kappel to describe the communication over the web server (column 1, lines 44-46).

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Discount et al. U. S. Patent no. 6,012,066 in view of Faloutsos et al. U. S. Patent no. 5,758,338.

7. Regarding claim 9, Discount discloses a process for performing administrative functions connected with a sales related database comprising the steps of:

- receiving login information from a client system;
- determining if the login information is valid;
- transmitting an administrative functions home page to the client system if the login information is valid (column 4, lines 55-67);
- receiving a function link selection from the client system (column 1, lines 10-33);
- determining which function link was selected;
- displaying an administrative function screen corresponding to the function link selected;

- receiving updated information in a predetermined format (column 9, lines 13-23);

Discount does not explicitly disclose updating the sales-related database to store the received updated information. Faloutsos, however, discloses these limitations on (column 3, lines 44-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the

Art Unit: 2171

invention to modify the teaching of Discount, as taught by Faloutsos, to process the information requests (column 1, lines 25-26).

Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Discount et al. U. S. Patent no. 6,012,066 in view of Faloutsos et al. U. S. Patent no. 5,758,338 and further in view of O'Neil et al. U. S. Patent no. 5,987,440.

8. Regarding claims 10-11, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 9. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 9 above. Furthermore, neither Discount nor Faloutsos discloses "broker information ". O'Neil, however, discloses this limitation on (column 1, lines 34-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teaching of Faloutsos, as taught by O'Neil to manage the brokers' information.

9. Regarding claim 12, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 11. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, O'Neil discloses the process of at least one broker information screen includes at least one of a broker detail screen, a broker contact information screen and a broker public key loading screen (FIG. 4 of O'Neil).

Art Unit: 2171

Claims 13-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Discount et al. U. S. Patent no. 6,012,066 in view of Faloutsos et al. U. S. Patent no. 5,758,338, further in view of O'Neil et al. U. S. Patent no. 5,987,440 and Raveis U. S. Parent no. 6,321,202.

10. Regarding claims 13-17, neither Faloutsos nor O'Neil discloses "a rate change", "report", "quote". It would have been obvious to have these information in real estate services as evidenced by Raveis because these are the elements of a complete mortgage processing.

11. Regarding claims 18-24, the elements of these claims have been rejected in the analysis above and these claims are rejected on that basis.

Art Unit: 2171

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh B Thai whose telephone number is 703-305-4883. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-9099 for regular communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Hanh Thai H
August 26, 2002


WAYNE AMSBURY
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER